

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-18 are pending in this application prior to entering this amendment.

The applicants amended claims 1, 16, and 18 in the previous response.

The examiner rejects claims 1-18 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,881,064) in view of Bloomfield (U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,729) and Crager (U.S. Pat. No. 4,058,838 to Crager et al.).

The applicants amend claims 1, 7, and 9-18.

The applicants add no new matter and request reconsideration.

Claims 1-5 and 7-18 remain pending after entering this amendment.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**Lin in view of Bloomfield and Crager: Claims 1-18**

The claims recite handling error correction between a central node and a fax machine over a public switching telephone network (PSTN) and sending that data error free over the packet switched network to another fax machine. Claim 1 recites in part:

a network device to accumulate a portion of the fax information received from the first fax machine over a public switching telephone network, to detect errors in the accumulated portion of the fax information using cyclic redundancy code (CRC) error checking and correction, to stall the second fax machine responsive to detecting errors in the accumulated portion of the fax information, and to send the accumulated portion of the fax information across the packet switching network to the second fax machine responsive to detecting no errors in the accumulated portion of the fax information.

The applicants agree that Lin does not disclose a network device for... accumulating the portion of the fax information until the portion is determined to be free of errors using cyclic redundancy...as required by claim 1. The applicants also agree with the examiner that Bloomfield does not disclose using cyclic redundancy code for error checking and correction of fax information over a PSTN in the manner recited in the claim 1. The examiner alleges Crager provides the missing link.

Crager involves a packet switched facsimile communication system operable in a store-and-forward mode. The cyclic redundancy code in Crager is used over the packet switched network. The CRC in Crager is in a packet header. Crager does not teach or suggest using CRC for a fax communication over a PSTN and accumulating the fax information to send it error free over the packet switching network. Since Crager does not


cure the deficiencies of Lin in view of Bloomfield, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Claims 1-5 and 7-15 depend from claim 1. Since dependent claims necessarily contain the limitations of claims from which they depend, claims 1-5 and 7-15 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 16-18 were rejected for "arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1." Since Crager does not cure the deficiencies of Lin in view of Bloomfield for claim 1, the analogous arguments are overcome for at least the same reasons. Therefore claims 1-5 and 7-18 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the applicants request reconsideration and allowance of all remaining claims. The applicants encourage the examiner to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Todd J. Iverson
Registration No. 53.057

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613

Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office via facsimile number
(571) 273-8300, on May 15, 2006.

Signature:


Judy Wignmore